

Packing Hamilton Cycles in Random and Pseudo-Random Hypergraphs

Alan Frieze*

Michael Krivelevich[†]

October 31, 2018

Abstract

We say that a k -uniform hypergraph C is a Hamilton cycle of type ℓ , for some $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, if there exists a cyclic ordering of the vertices of C such that every edge consists of k consecutive vertices and for every pair of consecutive edges E_{i-1}, E_i in C (in the natural ordering of the edges) we have $|E_{i-1} \cap E_i| = \ell$. We prove that for $\ell \leq k \leq 2\ell$, with high probability almost all edges of a random k -uniform hypergraph $H(n, p, k)$ with $p(n) \gg \log^2 n/n$ can be decomposed into edge disjoint type ℓ Hamilton cycles. We also provide sufficient conditions for decomposing almost all edges of a pseudo-random k -uniform hypergraph into type ℓ Hamilton cycles, for $\ell \leq k \leq 2\ell$. For the case $\ell = k$ these results show that almost all edges of corresponding random and pseudo-random hypergraphs can be packed into disjoint perfect matchings.

1 Introduction

The subject of Hamilton graphs and Hamiltonicity-related problems is undoubtedly one of the most central in Graph Theory, with great many deep and beautiful results obtained. Hamiltonicity problems occupy a place of honor in the theory of random graphs too, the reader can consult the monographs of Bollobás [3] and of Janson, Łuczak and Ruciński [9] for an account of some of the most important results related to Hamilton cycles in random graphs. Of particular relevance to the current work is a previous result of the authors [5] who

*Department of Mathematical Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh PA15213, U.S.A. Supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0753472.

[†]School of Mathematical Sciences, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel. Email: krivelev@post.tau.ac.il. Research supported in part by a USA-Israel BSF grant, by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation and by a Pazy Memorial Award.

proved that for edge probability $p = p(n) \geq n^{-\epsilon}$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$, **whp**¹ almost all edges of the random graph $G(n, p)$ can be packed into edge disjoint Hamilton cycles.

Quite a few results about Hamiltonicity of pseudo-random graphs are available too. Informally, a graph $G = (V, \mathcal{E})$ with $|V| = n$ vertices and $|\mathcal{E}| = m$ edges is pseudo-random if its edge distribution is similar, in some well defined quantitative way, to that of a truly random graph $G(n, p)$ with the same expected density $p = m \binom{n}{2}^{-1}$. A thorough discussion about pseudo-random graphs, their alternative definitions and properties can be found in survey [12]. It is well known that pseudo-randomness of graphs can be guaranteed by imposing conditions on vertex degrees and co-degrees (see, e.g., [15], [4]); we will adopt a similar approach later in the paper when discussing pseudo-random hypergraphs. There are known sufficient criteria for Hamiltonicity in pseudo-random graphs. Also, the above mentioned result of [5] can be extended to the pseudo-random case as well. Since we will employ this result in our arguments, let us state it here formally. A graph G on vertex set $[n]$ is (α, ϵ) -regular if

$$Q_a: \delta(G) \geq (\alpha - \epsilon)n.$$

$$Q_b: \text{ If } S, T \text{ are disjoint subsets of } [n] \text{ and } |S|, |T| \geq \epsilon n \text{ then } \left| \frac{e_G(S, T)}{|S||T|} - \alpha \right| \leq \epsilon, \text{ where } e_G(S, T) \text{ is the number of } S - T \text{ edges in } G.$$

The following is implied by the main theorem of [5]:

Theorem 1 *Let G be an (α, ϵ) -regular graph with n vertices where*

$$\alpha \gg \epsilon \text{ and } \alpha \epsilon^3 \gg \frac{1}{(n \log n)^{1/2}}.$$

Then G contains at least $(\alpha/2 - 4\epsilon)n$ edge disjoint Hamilton cycles.

Remark 1 *Theorem 2 of [5] only claims to be true for α constant. This was an unfortunate over-cautious statement. The real condition should be the one given in the above theorem.*

In contrast, much less is known about Hamiltonicity in hypergraphs in general and in random and pseudo-random hypergraphs in particular. Formally, a *hypergraph* H is an ordered pair $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$, where V is a set of vertices, and \mathcal{E} is a family of distinct subsets of V , called edges. A hypergraph H is *k-uniform* if all edges of H are of size k . It is generally believed that k -uniform hypergraphs for $k \geq 3$ are much more complicated objects of study than graphs (corresponding to $k = 2$). Specifically for Hamiltonicity, even extending the definition of a Hamilton cycle in graphs to the case of (uniform) hypergraphs is not a straightforward task. In fact, several alternative definitions are possible. In this paper (in some departure from a relatively standard notation) we will use the following definition. Denote

$$\nu_i = \frac{n}{i}, 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

¹An event \mathcal{E}_n occurs *with high probability*, or **whp** for brevity, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_n) = 1$.

Suppose that $1 \leq \ell \leq k$. A *type ℓ Hamilton cycle* in a k -uniform hypergraph $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ on n vertices is a collection of ν_ℓ edges of H such that for some cyclic order of $[n]$ every edge consists of k consecutive vertices and for every pair of consecutive edges E_{i-1}, E_i in C (in the natural ordering of the edges) we have $|E_{i-1} \setminus E_i| = \ell$. Thus, in a type ℓ Hamilton cycle the sets $C_i = E_i \setminus E_{i-1}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_\ell$, are a partition of V into sets of size ℓ . (An obvious necessary condition for the existence of a cycle of type ℓ in a hypergraph on n vertices is that ℓ divides n . We thus always assume, when discussing Hamilton cycles of type ℓ , that this necessary condition is fulfilled.) In the literature, when $\ell = 1$ we have a *tight* Hamilton cycle and when $\ell = k - 1$ we have a *loose* Hamilton cycle. In the extreme case $\ell = k$ the notion reduces to that of a perfect matching in a hypergraph.

Several recent papers (see, e.g., [8], [11], [13]) provided sufficient conditions for the existence of a type ℓ Hamilton cycle in a k -uniform hypergraph H on n vertices in terms of the minimum number of edges of H passing through any subset of $k - 1$ vertices, thus extending the classical Dirac sufficient condition for graph Hamiltonicity to the hypergraph case. These results however appear to be of rather limited relevance to the current paper, as here we are mostly concerned with sparse hypergraphs (with $o(|V|^k)$ edges), while the above mentioned results are for the (very) dense case.

The main goal of this paper at large is to study Hamiltonicity in random and pseudo-random hypergraphs. A *random k -uniform hypergraph* $H(n, p, k)$ is a hypergraph with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\} = [n]$, where each k -tuple of $[n]$ is an edge of the hypergraph independently with probability $p = p(n)$. For the case $k = 2$ the model $H(n, p, k)$ reduces to the classical binomial random graph $G(n, p)$. Essentially nothing appears to be known about Hamilton cycles in random hypergraphs. Even the most basic question of the threshold for the appearance of a cycle of type ℓ in $H(n, p, k)$ has not yet been addressed. One notable exception is the case $\ell = k$, i.e., the case of perfect matchings – a recent striking result of Johansson, Kahn and Vu [10] has established the order of magnitude of the threshold for the appearance of a perfect matching in a k -uniform random hypergraph.

In this paper, rather than studying the conditions for the existence of a single Hamilton cycle, we study the conditions for the existence of a *packing of almost all edges* of a random or a pseudo-random hypergraph into Hamilton cycles. For $\ell \geq k/2$ we manage to obtain non-trivial results in this direction. It appears that the cases of small ℓ (where adjacent edges along the Hamilton cycle have larger intersection) are harder.

Our first result is about packing Hamilton cycles in random hypergraphs.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that $\ell \leq k \leq 2\ell$ and suppose that $np/\log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$. Then **whp** $H = H(n, p, k)$ contains a collection of $(1 - \epsilon) \binom{n}{k} p/\nu_\ell$ edge disjoint type ℓ Hamilton cycles, where $\epsilon = O((\log n/(np)^{1/2})^{1/2}) = o(1)$.*

Note that for the case $\ell = k$ the above theorem provides a sufficient condition on the edge probability $p(n)$ for being able to pack **whp** almost all edges of $H(n, p, k)$ into perfect matchings.

Other results of the paper are about packing Hamilton cycles in pseudo-random hypergraphs. For most part, we state the condition of pseudo-randomness of a hypergraph in terms of the number of edges through subsets of vertices of fixed size. These conditions are suggested by the expected numbers of such edges in truly random hypergraphs of the same edge density and are easily seen to hold **whp** in random hypergraphs. Thus our results about pseudo-random hypergraphs are applicable to truly random instances as well. Naturally, the direct approach of Theorem 2 provides a better lower bound on the edge probability $p(n)$.

In this paper we are only able to deal with the case where $\ell \geq k/2$. Let $H = ([n], \mathcal{E})$ be a k -uniform hypergraph with vertex set $[n]$ and m edges. Its density $p = m/\binom{n}{k}$. For a set $X \subseteq [n]$ with $|X| = a < k$ we define its neighbourhood $N_H(X) = \left\{ Y \in \binom{[n]}{k-a} : X \cup Y \in \mathcal{E} \right\}$ and its degree $d_H(X) = |N_H(X)|$.

We first consider $k/2 < \ell < k$ and list the following properties. The value ϵ will be a parameter of *regularity*.

$$P_a: \min_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2(k-\ell)}} d_H(S) \geq \left\lceil (1 - \epsilon) \binom{n - 2(k - \ell)}{2\ell - k} p \right\rceil.$$

$$P_b: \min_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2\ell - k}} d_H(S) \geq \left\lceil (1 - \epsilon) \binom{n - 2\ell + k}{2(k - \ell)} p \right\rceil.$$

$$P_c: \max_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2(k-\ell)+1}} d_H(S) \leq \left\lfloor (1 + \epsilon) \binom{n - 2k + 2\ell - 1}{2\ell - k - 1} p \right\rfloor.$$

$$P_d: \max_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2\ell - k + 1}} d_H(S) \leq \left\lfloor (1 + \epsilon) \binom{n - 2\ell + k - 1}{2(k - \ell) - 1} p \right\rfloor.$$

$$P_e: \max_{\substack{S_1, S_2 \in \binom{[n]}{2\ell - k} \\ S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset}} |N_H(S_1) \cap N_H(S_2)| \leq \left\lfloor (1 + \epsilon) \binom{n - 2(2\ell - k)}{2(k - \ell)} p^2 \right\rfloor.$$

$$P_f: \max_{\substack{S_1, S_2 \in \binom{[n]}{2(k-\ell)} \\ |S_1 \cap S_2| = 0 \text{ or } k-\ell}} |N_H(S_1) \cap N_H(S_2)| \leq \left\lfloor (1 + \epsilon) \binom{n}{2\ell - k} p^2 \right\rfloor.$$

Theorem 3 *Let $H = ([n], \mathcal{E})$ be a k -uniform hypergraph with m edges, and let $k/2 < \ell < k$ and $1 > \epsilon^5 \gg \log^3 n / (n^{1/2} p^2)$. Suppose that H satisfies properties $\mathcal{P} = \{P_a, P_b, P_c, P_d, P_e, P_f\}$. Then H contains a collection of $(1 - 2\epsilon^{1/3})m/\nu_\ell$ edge disjoint type ℓ Hamilton cycles.*

The restriction $1 > \epsilon$ is for relevance and the restriction $\epsilon^5 \gg \log^3 n / (n^{1/2} p^2)$ is used in the proof (see Lemma 5).² The latter condition can be relaxed a little through a more careful implementation of our argument.

²We use the notation $a_n \gg b_n$ as shorthand for $a_n/b_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

When $\ell = k/2$ we will use the result from [5] as our main technical tool, and the above stated definition of (α, ϵ) -regular graphs. Here the definition of a pseudo-random hypergraph is explicitly tailored to our application. Let $H = (V, \mathcal{E})$ be a k -uniform hypergraph with vertex set $V = [n]$. Let $\mathcal{P} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{\nu_\ell})$ be a partition of $[n]$ into ν_ℓ parts each of size ℓ . The graph $G_{\mathcal{P}} = G_{\mathcal{P}}(H)$ has vertex set $[\nu_\ell]$ and an edge (i, j) whenever $E = X_i \cup X_j \in \mathcal{E}(H)$. We now say that H is (α, ϵ) -regular if for a randomly chosen \mathcal{P} , the graph $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ is (α, ϵ) -regular **qs**³.

Theorem 4 *Let $H = ([n], \mathcal{E})$ be a (p, ϵ) -regular k -uniform hypergraph with $k = 2\ell$ and*

$$\epsilon^4 np \gg \log^2 n \text{ and } \epsilon^5 np \gg \log(1/\epsilon) \log n.$$

Then H contains a collection of $(1 - 20\epsilon)\binom{n}{k}p/\nu_\ell$ edge disjoint type ℓ Hamilton cycles.

We finally consider the case $k = \ell$. Here we will be packing perfect matchings as opposed to Hamilton cycles. Let $k_X = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and $k_Y = \lceil k/2 \rceil$.

$$R_a: \min_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k_X}} d_H(S) \geq \left[(1 - \epsilon) \binom{n - k_X}{k_Y} p \right].$$

$$R_b: \min_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k_Y}} d_H(S) \geq \left[(1 - \epsilon) \binom{n - k_Y}{k_X} p \right].$$

$$R_c: \max_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k_X+1}} d_H(S) \leq \left[(1 + \epsilon) \binom{n - k_X - 1}{k_Y - 1} p \right].$$

$$R_d: \max_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k_Y+1}} d_H(S) \leq \left[(1 + \epsilon) \binom{n - k_Y - 1}{k_X - 1} p \right].$$

$$R_e: \max_{\substack{S_1, S_2 \in \binom{[n]}{k_X} \\ S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset}} |N_H(S_1) \cap N_H(S_2)| \leq \left[(1 + \epsilon) \binom{n - 2k_X}{k_Y} p^2 \right].$$

$$R_f: \max_{\substack{S_1, S_2 \in \binom{[n]}{k_Y} \\ S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset}} |N_H(S_1) \cap N_H(S_2)| \leq \left[(1 + \epsilon) \binom{n - 2k_Y}{k_X} p^2 \right].$$

Theorem 5 *Let $H = ([n], \mathcal{E})$ be a k -uniform hypergraph with m edges that satisfies $\mathcal{R} = \{R_a, R_b, R_c, R_d, R_e, R_f\}$ and suppose that $1 \gg \epsilon \gg \log^5 n / (n^{1/2} p^2)$. Then H contains a collection of $(1 - 4\epsilon^{1/3})m/\nu_k$ edge disjoint perfect matchings.*

³An event \mathcal{E}_n occurs *quite surely*, or **qs** for brevity, if $\mathbf{Pr}(\mathcal{E}_n) = 1 - O(n^{-C})$ for any positive constant C .

An interesting point of reference for our theorems is results about *perfect* decompositions of the edge set of a complete k -uniform hypergraph K_n^k into Hamilton cycles of various types (assuming of course some natural divisibility conditions). These include a recent result of Bailey and Stevens [1] about packing tight Hamilton cycles and a famous result of Baranyai [2] about decomposing the edge set of K_n^k into perfect matchings. While we do not – and can not for obvious reasons – achieve perfect decomposition, but rather pack almost all edges, our results apply to a wide class of hypergraphs, including relatively sparse hypergraphs.

In the next section we focus on $H = H(n, p, k)$ and first prove Theorem 2 for $k = 3$. We then give a proof for general k . In Section 3 we prove Theorems 3, 4 and 5. The last section is devoted to concluding remarks.

2 Random hypergraphs

We prove Theorem 2 in this section.

The proof for $2\ell > k$ is based on the same idea as for the case $k = 3, \ell = 2$ but is heavier on notation and will be given immediately afterwards. Hopefully, the reader will find it useful to consider the simplest case first. The proof for random hypergraphs is simpler than the proof for regular (i.e., pseudo-random) hypergraphs and hopefully will help in the understanding of the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4.

Case 1: $k = 3, \ell = 2$.

We will construct the Hamilton cycles via the following algorithm:

A_1 : Choose $r = n(np)^{1/2}$ random partitions $(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, of V into two sets of size ν_2 .

We use the notation

$$X_i = \{x_{i,1} < x_{i,2} < \dots < x_{i,\nu_2}\} \text{ and } Y_i = \{y_{i,1} < y_{i,2} < \dots < y_{i,\nu_2}\}.$$

For each i we choose a random permutation σ_i on X_i and define a Hamilton cycle

$$\Gamma_i = (x_{i,\sigma_i(1)}, x_{i,\sigma_i(2)}, \dots, x_{i,\sigma_i(\nu_2)}).$$

A_2 : At this point we expose the edges of $H(n, p, 3) = ([n], \mathcal{E}_p)$.

A_3 : Suppose now that for edge $E \in \mathcal{E}_p$ there are $f(E)$ instances i such that $|X_i \cap E| = 2$ and $X_i \cap E$ is an edge of Γ_i . If $f(E) > 0$, then choose one of the $f(E)$ instances at random and label the edge E with the chosen i ; if $f(E) = 0$, the edge E stays unlabelled. Let $H_i \subset H$ be the subhypergraph of all edges labelled by i .

A_4 : Let G_i be the bipartite graph with vertex set $A_i \cup Y_i$ defined as follows: A_i is a copy of $[\nu_2]$ (viewed as the set of edges of the Hamilton cycle Γ_i). Add edge (a, b) to G_i if

$E = (x_{i,\sigma_i(a)}, y_{i,b}, x_{i,\sigma_i(a+1)}) \in H_i$ (i.e., $(a, b) \in G_i$ if the a -th edge of the cycle Γ_i united with the vertex y_b forms an edge E of H labeled by i).

A_5 : We claim that **whp** (see Lemma 1 below) each G_i will contain at least

$$n_0 = (1 - \epsilon)\nu_2 p_0$$

edge disjoint perfect matchings.

Here

$$\epsilon = \left(\frac{72n \log n}{r} \right)^{1/2} \text{ and } f_0 = r\rho + (12r\rho \log n)^{1/2} \text{ and } p_0 = \frac{p}{f_0}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\rho = \rho_{3,2}$ where

$$\rho_{k,\ell} = \frac{\nu_\ell^2}{\binom{n}{k}}.$$

Remark 2 Note that ρ is the probability that instance i is one of the $f(E)$ instances in A_3 for edge $E \in \mathcal{E}$.

Each such matching gives rise to a loose Hamilton cycle of H_i and these will be edge disjoint by construction. Indeed suppose that our matching is $(e_a, \phi(e_a))$, $a = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_2$, where the edges e_a are ordered according to the order of their appearance along the Hamilton cycle Γ_i . From this we obtain the type 2 Hamilton cycle with edges $E_a = e_a \cup \{\phi(e_a)\}$. Since the subhypergraphs H_i are edge disjoint and since distinct edges in the graph G_i correspond to distinct edges of H_i , the so obtained Hamilton cycles in H are indeed edge disjoint.

It follows that **whp** $H(n, p, 3)$ contains at least rn_0 edge disjoint Hamilton cycles, proving Theorem 2 for this case.

Lemma 1

$$\Pr(G_i \text{ does not contain } n_0 \text{ edge disjoint perfect matchings}) = o(n^{-3}).$$

Proof The Max-Flow Min-Cut theorem tells us that the following is a necessary and sufficient condition for Γ_i to have n_0 edge disjoint perfect matchings: Suppose that we make up a network with source σ and sink τ and join σ to each vertex of $A = A_i$ by an edge of capacity n_0 and each vertex of $B = Y_i$ to τ by an edge of capacity n_0 . Each edge of $G = \Gamma_i$ is given capacity one. Suppose that our minimum cut is $X : \bar{X}$ and $S = A \cap X$ and $T = B \cap X$ then a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of n_0 disjoint perfect matchings is that

$$(\nu_2 - |S|)n_0 + |T|n_0 + e(S, B \setminus T) \geq n_0\nu_2$$

which reduces to

$$m \geq (s - t)n_0 \tag{2}$$

for all $S \subseteq A, T \subseteq B$, if $|S| = s, |T| = t, m = e(S, B \setminus T)$.

Note that we need only verify (2) computationally for $t \leq \nu_2/2$. When $t > \nu_2/2$ we could repeat our computations to show that **whp** $e(B \setminus T, A \setminus (A \setminus S)) \geq ((\nu_2 - t) - (\nu_2 - s))n_0$.

For a triple $E \subset [n]$, we say that $1 \leq i \leq r$ *includes* E if the set $E \cap X_i$ is of size 2 and is one of the edges of the cycle Γ_i . Thus the random variable $f(E)$ counts the number of partitions (X_i, Y_i) that include E . Observe that the i -th partition includes a fixed triple E with probability

$$\binom{3}{2} \frac{\binom{n-3}{\nu_2-2}}{\binom{n}{\nu_2}} \frac{\nu_2}{\binom{\nu_2}{2}} = \frac{3n}{2(n-1)(n-2)} = \frac{\nu_2^2}{\binom{n}{3}}$$

(first choose two elements of $E \cap X_i$, then choose X_i to intersect E in exactly these two elements, then choose a Hamilton cycle in X_i – due to symmetry the probability that $E \cap X_i$ is one of its ν_2 edges is $\nu_2 \binom{\nu_2}{2}^{-1}$). Moreover the events “ i includes E ” are mutually independent for different i . Therefore, the random variable $f(E)$ is distributed binomially with parameters r and ρ . Now using the following Chernoff bounds for $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$:

$$\Pr(\text{Bin}(m, \xi) - m\xi \leq -\epsilon m\xi) \leq e^{-\epsilon^2 m\xi/2} \tag{3}$$

$$\Pr(\text{Bin}(m, \xi) - m\xi \geq \epsilon m\xi) \leq e^{-\epsilon^2 m\xi/3} \tag{4}$$

we see that with probability at least $1 - o(1)$ we have $1 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$ for all $\binom{n}{3}$ possible edges. So assume that indeed $1 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$ for all E . Moreover, the values of $f(E)$ are determined by Steps A_1 and A_2 of our construction and are thus independent of the appearance of random edges at Step A_3 . For $1 \leq a, b \leq \nu_2$, the pair (a, b) is an edge of the random auxiliary graph G_i if the corresponding triple E is an edge of the random hypergraph H and is chosen to be labelled by i . Thus $(a, b) \in E(G_i)$ independently and with probability at least $p/f_0 = p_0$.

Therefore we can **whp** reduce our problem to showing that **whp** the random bipartite graph K_{ν_2, ν_2, p_0} contains n_0 edge disjoint perfect matchings.

Then with ϵ as defined in (1),

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(\exists S \subseteq A, T \subseteq B, |S| > |T|, |T| \leq \nu_2/2 : e(S, B \setminus T) \leq (1 - \epsilon)|S|(\nu_2 - |T|)p_0) \leq \\ & \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_2} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_2/2\}} \binom{\nu_2}{s} \binom{\nu_2}{t} \exp\left\{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}s(\nu_2 - t)p_0\right\} \leq \\ & \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_2} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_2/2\}} \binom{\nu_2}{s} \binom{\nu_2}{t} \exp\{-\epsilon^2 s\nu_2 p_0/4\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Assume first that $\binom{\nu_2}{s} \geq \binom{\nu_2}{t}$. Then

$$(5) \leq \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_2} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_2/2\}} \left(\frac{n^2 e^2}{4s^2} \cdot e^{-\epsilon^2 \nu_2 p_0/4}\right)^s = \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_2} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_2/2\}} \left(\frac{n^2 e^2}{4s^2} \cdot n^{-6+o(1)}\right)^s = o(n^{-3}).$$

When $\binom{\nu_2}{s} \leq \binom{\nu_2}{t}$ we can replace (5) by

$$\sum_{s=\nu_2/2}^{\nu_2} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_2/2\}} \left(\frac{n^2 e^2}{4t^2} \cdot n^{-6+o(1)} \right)^t = o(n^{-3}).$$

Here we have used $s \geq t$. □

It follows (see (2)) that **whp**

$$m \geq (1 - \epsilon)s(\nu_2 - t)np_0 \geq (1 - \epsilon)(s - t)np_0/2 = (s - t)nn_0.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3 for $k = 3, \ell = 2$.

With a roadmap in mind, we proceed to the general case.

Case 2: $\ell < k < 2\ell$.

We will construct the Hamilton cycles via the following algorithm:

B_1 : Let

$$N_X = \frac{k - \ell}{\ell}n \text{ and } N_Y = \frac{2\ell - k}{\ell}n.$$

Choose $r = n^{k-2}(np)^{1/2}$ random partitions $(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, of $[n]$ into two sets of size N_X and N_Y respectively.

We use the notation

$$X_i = \{x_{i,1} < x_{i,2} < \dots < x_{i,N_X}\} \text{ and } Y_i = \{y_{i,1} < y_{i,2} < \dots < y_{i,N_Y}\}.$$

B_2 : At this point we expose the edges of $H(n, p, k) = ([n], \mathcal{E}_p)$.

B_3 : For each i we let σ_i be a random permutation of X_i and let τ_i be a random permutation of Y_i . Form the partition $X_{i,a}, a = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_\ell$, of X_i into sets of size $k - \ell$ and the partition $Y_{i,b}, b = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_\ell$, of Y_i into sets of size $2\ell - k$. Here $X_{i,a} = \{x_{i,\sigma_i((a-1)(k-\ell)+1)}, \dots, x_{i,\sigma_i(a(k-\ell))}\}$ and $Y_{i,b} = \{y_{i,\tau_i((b-1)(2\ell-k)+1)}, \dots, y_{i,\tau_i(b(2\ell-k))}\}$.

We define the ‘‘Hamilton cycle’’

$$\Gamma_i = (X_{i,1}, X_{i,2}, \dots, X_{i,\nu_\ell}).$$

B_4 : Suppose now that for $E \in \mathcal{E}_p$ there are $f(E)$ instances i such that for some a, b and some partition S_1, S_2, S_3 of E we have $S_1 = X_{i,a}, S_2 = X_{i,a+1}$ (where we set $\nu_\ell + 1$ to be equal to 1) and $S_3 = Y_{i,b}$. We say that i includes E . Choose one of the $f(E)$ instances at random and label edge E with the chosen i . If $f(E) = 0$, the edge E stays unlabeled. Let H_i be the subhypergraph of H formed by the edges of H labeled by i .

B_5 : Let G_i be the bipartite graph with vertex partition A_i and B_i comprising disjoint copies of $[\nu_\ell]$. For $a \in A_i$ and $b \in B_i$ we make (a, b) an edge of G_i if $E = X_{i,a} \cup Y_{i,b} \cup X_{i,a+1} \in \mathcal{E}_p$ and E is labelled with i .

B_6 : We claim (see Lemma 2) that **whp** each G_i will contain at least

$$n_0 = (1 - \epsilon)\nu_\ell p_0$$

edge disjoint perfect matchings.

Here

$$\epsilon = \left(\frac{4(k+3)k! \log n}{\ell(np)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad f_0 = \rho r + (4k\rho r \log n)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad p_0 = \frac{p}{f_0}, \quad (6)$$

where $\rho = \rho_{k,\ell}$.

Each such matching gives rise to a type ℓ Hamilton cycle of H and these will be edge disjoint by construction.

In this way we obtain at least rn_0 edge disjoint Hamilton cycles, proving Theorem 2 for the case $\ell < k < 2\ell$. \square

Lemma 2

$$\Pr(G_i \text{ does not contain } n_0 \text{ edge disjoint perfect matchings}) = o(n^{-k}).$$

Proof The edges of G_i appear independently with probability $p/f(E)$ where $f(E)$ has distribution $\text{Bin}(r, \rho)$. (To see it, for a fixed partition (X_i, Y_i) and a fixed pair of permutations (σ_i, τ_i) of X_i, Y_i , resp., the index i includes ν_ℓ^2 k -tuples from $[n]$. Therefore by symmetry a random i includes a fixed k -tuple E with probability $\frac{\nu_\ell^2}{\binom{n}{k}} = \rho_{k,\ell}$.) So (3) and (4) imply that $1 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$ with probability $1 - O(n^{-4k/3})$.

We have reduced our problem to showing that **whp** the random bipartite graph $K_{\nu_\ell, \nu_\ell, p_0}$ contains n_0 edge disjoint perfect matchings. We need to verify (2) computationally for $t \leq \nu_\ell/2$. Then with ϵ as defined in (6),

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(\exists S \subseteq A, T \subseteq B, |S| \geq |T|, |T| \leq \nu_\ell/2 : e(S, B \setminus T) \leq (1 - \epsilon)|S|(\nu_\ell - |T|)p_0) \leq \\ & \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_\ell} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_\ell/2\}} \binom{\nu_\ell}{s} \binom{\nu_\ell}{t} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} s(\nu_\ell - t)p_0 \right\} \leq \\ & \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_\ell} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_\ell/2\}} \binom{\nu_\ell}{s} \binom{\nu_\ell}{t} \exp \left\{ -\epsilon^2 s\nu_\ell p_0/4 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Assume first that $\binom{\nu_\ell}{s} \geq \binom{\nu_\ell}{t}$. Then

$$(7) \leq \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_\ell} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_\ell/2\}} \left(\frac{n^2 e^2}{\ell^2 s^2} \cdot e^{-\epsilon^2 \nu_\ell p_0 / 4} \right)^s \leq \sum_{s=1}^{\nu_\ell} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_\ell/2\}} \left(\frac{n^2 e^2}{\ell^2 s^2} \cdot n^{-k-3} \right)^s = o(n^{-k}).$$

When $\binom{\nu_\ell}{s} \leq \binom{\nu_\ell}{t}$ we can replace (7) by

$$\sum_{s=\nu_\ell/2}^{\nu_\ell} \sum_{t=1}^{\min\{s-1, \nu_\ell/2\}} \left(\frac{n^2 e^2}{\ell^2 t^2} \cdot n^{-k-3} \right)^t = o(n^{-k}).$$

Here we have used $s \geq t$. □

Case 3: $k = 2\ell$.

When $\ell = k/2$ we have $N_Y = 0$ and the argument above breaks down. We can however use our result from [5] to obtain something.

We will construct the Hamilton cycles via the following algorithm:

C_1 : Choose $r = n^{k-2}(np)^{1/2}$ random partitions $\mathcal{P}_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, of $[n]$ into ν_ℓ sets $X_{i,a}$ of size ℓ .

C_2 : Expose the edges of $H(n, p, k) = ([n], \mathcal{E}_p)$.

C_3 : For each $E \in \mathcal{E}_p$ we let $f(E)$ denote the number of partitions i such that \mathcal{P}_i contains a pair of parts $X_{i,a}, X_{i,b}$ such that $X_{i,a} \cup X_{i,b} = E$. The random variable $f(E)$ is distributed as $\text{Bin}(r, \rho)$ where

$$\rho = \frac{\binom{\nu_\ell}{2}}{\binom{n}{k}}.$$

So (3) and (4) imply that $(1 - \epsilon)f_0 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$ with probability $1 - O(n^{-4k/3})$. Choose one of these $f(E)$ instances at random and label the edge E with the chosen i . Let H_i be the subhypergraph of all edges of H labeled by i . Here we can use ϵ, f_0, p_0 as in (6).

C_5 : For each i let G_i be the graph with vertex set $[\nu_\ell]$, where $a, b \in [\nu_\ell]$ are connected by an edge if $X_{i,a} \cup X_{i,b}$ is an edge of H labeled by i . We will show below in Lemma 3 that \mathbf{qs} each G_i is $((1 - 2\epsilon)p_0, 2\epsilon p_0)$ -regular.

C_6 : We then apply Theorem 1 to show that \mathbf{qs} each G_i contains at least $((1 - 2\epsilon)p_0/2 - 8\epsilon p_0) \nu_\ell$ edge disjoint Hamilton cycles. Each such Hamilton cycle corresponds to a Hamilton cycle of type ℓ in H_i , and the Hamilton cycles so obtained are edge disjoint.

Thus H contains at least

$$r ((1 - 2\epsilon)p_0/2 - 8\epsilon p_0) \nu_\ell \geq \binom{n}{k} \frac{p}{\nu_\ell} (1 - 20\epsilon)$$

edge disjoint type ℓ Hamilton cycles, completing the proof of Theorem 2 for this case.

Lemma 3 *Each G_i is $\mathbf{qs}((1 - 2\epsilon)p_0, 2\epsilon p_0)$ -regular.*

Proof The degree of vertex v in G_i dominates $\text{Bin}(\nu_\ell - 1, p_0)$ and so Property Q_a holds from Chernoff bounds. Observe that $\nu_\ell p_0 = \Omega((np)^{1/2}) \gg \log n$. Similarly the number of edges between two sets S, T dominates $\text{Bin}(|S||T|, p_0)$ and is dominated by $\text{Bin}(|S||T|, (1 - \epsilon)^{-1}p_0)$ and Property Q_b also holds from Chernoff bounds. \square

Case 4: $k = \ell$.

Here the aim is to find many edge disjoint perfect matchings. We construct them via the following algorithm:

D_1 : Let $k_X = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and $k_Y = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and

$$N_X = \frac{k_X}{k}n \text{ and } N_Y = \frac{k_Y}{k}n.$$

D_2 : Choose $r = n^{k-2}(np)^{1/2}$ random partitions $(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, of $[n]$ into two sets of size N_X and N_Y respectively.

We use the notation

$$X_i = \{x_{i,1} < x_{i,2} < \dots < x_{i,N_X}\} \text{ and } Y_i = \{y_{i,1} < y_{i,2} < \dots < y_{i,N_Y}\}.$$

D_3 : At this point we expose the edges of $H(n, p, k) = ([n], \mathcal{E}_p)$.

D_4 : For each i we let σ_i be a random permutation of X_i and let τ_i be a random permutation of Y_i . Form the partition $X_{i,a}, a = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_k$, of X_i , into sets of size k_X and the partition $Y_{i,b}, b = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_k$, of Y_i into sets of size k_Y . Here $X_{i,a} = \{x_{i,\sigma_i((a-1)k_X+1)}, \dots, x_{i,\sigma_i(ak_X)}\}$ and $Y_{i,b} = \{y_{i,\tau_i((b-1)k_Y+1)}, \dots, y_{i,\tau_i(bk_Y)}\}$.

D_5 : Suppose now that for $E \in \mathcal{E}_p$ there are $f(E)$ instances i such that for some a, b and some partition S_1, S_2 of E we have $S_1 = X_{i,a}$ and $S_2 = Y_{i,b}$. We say that i includes E . Choose one of the $f(E)$ instances at random and label edge E with the chosen i .

D_6 : Let G_i be the bipartite graph with vertex partition (A_i, B_i) comprising disjoint copies of $[\nu_k]$. For $a \in A_i$ and $b \in B_i$ we make (a, b) an edge of G_i if $E = X_{i,a} \cup Y_{i,b} \in \mathcal{E}_p$ and E is labelled with i . So, by construction, each $E \in \mathcal{E}_p$ is associated with at most one G_i .

D_7 : We claim (see Lemma 4) that **whp** each G_i will contain at least

$$n_0 = (1 - \epsilon)\nu_k p_0$$

edge disjoint perfect matchings.

Here

$$\epsilon = 10k! \left(\frac{4(k+3)k! \log n}{\ell(np)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/2} \text{ and } f_0 = \rho r + (4k\rho r \log n)^{1/2} \text{ and } p_0 = \frac{p}{f_0}, \quad (8)$$

where $\rho = \rho_{k,k}$.

Thus **whp** H contains at least rn_0 edge disjoint perfect matchings and this completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 4

$$\Pr(G_i \text{ does not contain } n_0 \text{ edge disjoint perfect matchings}) = o(n^{-k}).$$

Proof The edges of G_i appear independently with probability $p/f(E)$ where $f(E)$ has distribution $Bin(r, \rho)$. So (3) and (4) imply that $1 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$ with probability $1 - O(n^{-4k/3})$.

We have reduced our problem to showing that **whp** the random bipartite graph K_{ν_k, ν_k, p_0} contains n_0 edge disjoint perfect matchings. We need to verify (2) computationally for $t \leq \nu_k/2$. We follow the proof of Lemma 2 with $\ell = k$. \square

3 Pseudo-random hypergraphs

In this section we prove Theorems 3, 4 and 5. We follow the same strategy as described in Section 2. There are complications caused by the notation that we have to add and also by the fact that H is not random.

Case 1: $\ell < k < 2\ell$ (Theorem 3).

We will construct the Hamilton cycles via the following algorithm: First choose f_0 such that

$$\frac{\log^2 n}{\epsilon^4} \ll f_0^2 \ll \frac{\epsilon n^{1/2} p^2}{\log n}. \tag{9}$$

E_1 : Let

$$r = (1 - \epsilon) \binom{n}{k} \frac{f_0}{\nu_\ell^2}; \quad p_0 = \frac{p}{f_0}.$$

E_2 : Let

$$N_X = \frac{k - \ell}{\ell} n \text{ and } N_Y = \frac{2\ell - k}{\ell} n.$$

Now choose r random partitions $(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, of $[n]$ into two sets of size N_X and N_Y respectively.

We use the notation

$$X_i = \{x_{i,1} < x_{i,2} < \dots < x_{i,N_X}\} \text{ and } Y_i = \{y_{i,1} < y_{i,2} < \dots < y_{i,N_Y}\}.$$

E_3 : For each i we let σ_i be a random permutation of X_i and let τ_i be a random permutation of Y_i . Form the partition $X_{i,a}, a = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_\ell$, of X_i into sets of size $k - \ell$

and the partition $Y_{i,b}, b = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_\ell$, of Y_i into sets of size $2\ell - k$. Here $X_{i,a} = \{x_{i,\sigma_i((a-1)(k-\ell)+1)}, \dots, x_{i,\sigma_i(a(k-\ell))}\}$ and $Y_{i,b} = \{y_{i,\tau_i((b-1)(2\ell-k)+1)}, \dots, y_{i,\tau_i(b(2\ell-k))}\}$.

We define the ‘‘Hamilton cycle’’

$$\Gamma_i = (X_{i,1}, X_{i,2}, \dots, X_{i,\nu_\ell}).$$

E_4 : Suppose now that for $E \in \mathcal{E}$ there are $f(E)$ instances i such that for some a, b and some partition S_1, S_2, S_3 of E we have $S_1 = X_{i,a}, S_2 = X_{i,a+1}$ and $S_3 = Y_{i,b}$. Choose one of the $f(E)$ instances at random and label edge E with the chosen i .

Thus $f(E)$ is distributed as $\text{Bin}(r, \rho)$ where $\rho = \rho_{k,\ell}$. So (3) and (4) imply that $(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon)f_0 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$ with probability $1 - o(n^{-k})$.

E_5 : Let G_i be the bipartite graph with vertex partition A_i and B_i comprising disjoint copies of $[\nu_\ell]$. For $a \in A_i$ and $b \in B_i$ we make (a, b) an edge of G_i if $E = X_{i,a} \cup Y_{i,b} \cup X_{i,a+1} \in \mathcal{E}$ and E is labelled with i .

E_6 : We claim that **whp** (see Lemma 6 below) each G_i will contain at least

$$n_0 = (1 - (5\epsilon)^{1/3})\nu_\ell p_0$$

edge disjoint perfect matchings.

Each such matching gives rise to a type ℓ Hamilton cycle of H and these will be edge disjoint by construction.

In this way we obtain at least

$$rn_0 \geq \binom{n}{k} \frac{p}{\nu_\ell} (1 - (5\epsilon)^{1/3} - \epsilon)$$

edge disjoint Hamilton cycles, proving Theorem 3 for the case $\ell < k < 2\ell$.

We will show later (Lemma 6 below) that if we can prove that the degrees and co-degrees of our bipartite graphs G_i ‘‘behave’’, then we can deduce the existence of many disjoint perfect matchings and so get our packing of Hamilton cycles. Given Lemma 6, all we need to do is to estimate the degrees and co-degrees of vertices in a fixed G_i .

Lemma 5 Whp, over our random choices of $X_i, Y_i, \sigma_i, \tau_i$, each G_i has minimum degree at least $(1 - 2\epsilon)\nu_\ell p_0$ and maximum co-degree of at most $(1 + 5\epsilon)\nu_\ell p_0^2$.

Proof We fix i and focus on G_i . We first show that the minimum degree in G_i is large. We first fix $a \in A_i$. The vertex a corresponds to the block $X_{i,a}$ of σ_i . Condition on $X_{i,a} \cup X_{i,a+1} = S$

for some $S \subset [n]$, $|S| = 2(k - \ell)$. We expose a random subset Y_i first. Let Z_a^* be the number of edges $E \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $S \subset E$ and $E \cap Y_i = E - S$. For each edge $E \in N_H(S)$

$$\Pr(E \cap Y_i = E - S) = \frac{\binom{n-k}{N_Y - (2\ell - k)}}{\binom{n-2(k-\ell)}{N_Y}} = \frac{(N_Y)_{2\ell - k}}{(n - 2(k - \ell))_{2\ell - k}} = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \left(\frac{2\ell - k}{\ell}\right)^{2\ell - k}.$$

Therefore by assumption P_a ,

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_a^*) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \left(\frac{2\ell - k}{\ell}\right)^{2\ell - k} \binom{n - 2(k - \ell)}{2\ell - k} p.$$

Since changing the fate of one vertex with respect to the choice of Y_i changes the value of Z_a^* by at most

$$\Delta_a = \max_{S' \in \binom{[n]}{2(k-\ell)+1}} d_H(S'),$$

and the latter quantity is bounded by $(1 + \epsilon) \binom{n}{2\ell - k - 1} p$ by assumption P_c , we get by the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality that for any $t > 0$

$$\Pr(Z_a^* \leq \mathbf{E}(Z_a^*) - t) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{2t^2}{n\Delta_a^2}\right\}. \quad (10)$$

Here we are using the following inequality: Let S_n denote the set of permutations of $[n]$ and let $f : S_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ be such that $|f(\pi) - f(\pi')| \leq u$ whenever π' is obtained from π by transposing two elements. Then if π is chosen randomly from S_n then

$$\Pr(f(\pi) - \mathbf{E}(f) \leq -t) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{2t^2}{nu^2}\right\}. \quad (11)$$

For a proof see e.g., Section 3.2 of [14] or Lemma 11 of [7].

In this context, think of choosing a random m -subset of $[n]$ as choosing a random π and then taking the first m elements as your subset.

Plugging in the estimates on $\mathbf{E}(Z_a^*)$ and Δ_a stated above in (11), we get that **qs** for every $a \in A_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_a^* &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \left(\frac{2\ell - k}{\ell}\right)^{2\ell - k} \binom{n - 2(k - \ell)}{2\ell - k} p - n^{2\ell - k - 1/2} p \log n \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{2\ell - k}{\ell}\right)^{2\ell - k} \binom{n}{2\ell - k} p. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

So assume that Y_i is chosen so that (12) holds. Now we expose the random permutation τ_i of Y_i . Let Z_a be the degree of a in G_i , which is the number of edges $E \in \mathcal{E}$ such that

1. $E \cap Y_i = E - S$ (the number of such edges is Z_a^*);

2. $E \cap Y_i$ forms a block $Y_{i,b}$ under τ_i ;
3. E is labeled by i (this happens independently and with probability $1/f(E) \geq 1/f_0$).

Hence,

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_a) \geq Z_a^* \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_Y}{2\ell-k}} \frac{1}{f_0}.$$

Observe that changing τ_i by a single transposition changes the value of Z_a by at most 2 (at most two blocks $Y_{i,b}$ are affected by such a change). Therefore, applying concentration results for permutation graphs we get that for any $t > 0$

$$\Pr(Z_a \leq \mathbf{E}(Z_a) - t) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{2N_Y} \right\}.$$

Thus **qs** for every partition i and for every $a \in A_i$, its degree in G_i is at least

$$\left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{2\ell-k}{\ell}\right)^{2\ell-k} \binom{n}{2\ell-k} p \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_Y}{2\ell-k}} \frac{1}{f_0} - n^{1/2} \log n \geq (1-2\epsilon)\nu_\ell p_0,$$

due to our assumption on ϵ .

The argument for the degrees of the vertices of B_i is quite similar. Fix $b \in B_i$. The vertex b corresponds to the block $Y_{i,b}$ of τ_i . Condition on $Y_{i,b} = S$ for some $S \subset [n]$, $|S| = 2\ell - k$. We expose a random subset X_i first. Let Z_b^* be the number of edges $E \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $S \subset E$ and $E \cap X_i = E - S$. For each edge $E \in N_H(S)$

$$\Pr(E \cap X_i = E - S) = \frac{\binom{n-k}{N_X - 2(k-\ell)}}{\binom{n-(2\ell-k)}{N_X}} = \frac{(N_X)_{2k-2\ell}}{(n - (2\ell - k))_{2k-2\ell}} = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \left(\frac{k-\ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k-2\ell}.$$

Therefore by assumption P_b ,

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_b^*) \geq (1-\epsilon) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \left(\frac{k-\ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k-2\ell} \binom{n-2\ell+k}{2(k-\ell)} p.$$

Since changing the fate of one vertex with respect to the choice of X_i changes the value of Z_b^* by at most

$$\Delta_b = \max_{S' \in \binom{[n]}{2\ell-k+1}} d_H(S'),$$

and the latter quantity is bounded by $(1+\epsilon)\binom{n}{2k-2\ell-1}p$ by assumption P_a , we get by (11) that for any $t > 0$

$$\Pr(Z_b^* \leq \mathbf{E}(Z_b^*) - t) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{2t^2}{n\Delta_b^2} \right\}.$$

Plugging in the estimates on $\mathbf{E}(Z_b^*)$ and Δ_b stated above, we get that \mathbf{q}_s for every $b \in B_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_b^* &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \left(\frac{k - \ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k - 2\ell} \binom{n - 2\ell + k}{2(k - \ell)} p - n^{2k - 2\ell - 1/2} p \log n \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{k - \ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k - 2\ell} \binom{n}{2k - 2\ell} p. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

So assume that X_i is chosen so that (13) holds. Now we expose the random permutation σ_i of X_i . Let Z_b be the degree of b in G_i , which is the number of edges $E \in \mathcal{E}$ such that

1. $E \cap X_i = E - S$ (the number of such edges is Z_b^*);
2. $E \cap X_i$ forms two consecutive blocks $X_{i,a}, X_{i,a+1}$ under σ_i ;
3. E is labeled by i (this happens independently and with probability $1/f(E) \geq 1/f_0$).

Hence,

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_b) \geq Z_b^* \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_X}{2k - 2\ell}} \frac{1}{f_0}.$$

Observe that changing σ_i by a single transposition changes the value of Z_b by at most 4. Therefore, applying again concentration results for permutation graphs we get that for any $t > 0$

$$\Pr(Z_b \leq \mathbf{E}(Z_b) - t) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{8N_X}\right\}.$$

Thus \mathbf{q}_s for every partition i and for every $b \in B_i$, its degree in G_i is at least

$$\left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{k - \ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k - 2\ell} \binom{n}{2k - 2\ell} p \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_X}{2k - 2\ell}} \frac{1}{f_0} - n^{1/2} \log n \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)\nu_\ell p_0,$$

due to our assumption on ϵ .

Now we treat typical co-degrees in the graph G_i . First fix $b_1, b_2 \in B_i$ and and Y_{i,b_1}, Y_{i,b_2} and expose a random set X_i . Let Z_{b_1, b_2}^* be the number of subsets $S_1 \subset [n]$ of cardinality $|S_1| = 2(k - \ell)$ such that $S_1 \subset X_i$ and both $S_1 \cup Y_{i,b_1}$ and $S_1 \cup Y_{i,b_2}$ form an edge in \mathcal{E} . By our assumption P_e ,

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_{b_1, b_2}^*) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \left(\frac{k - \ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k - 2\ell} \binom{n - 2(2\ell - k)}{2(k - \ell)} p^2.$$

Using assumption P_d we see that changing X_i by one element changes Z_{b_1, b_2}^* by at most

$$\Delta_{b_1, b_2} = \max_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2\ell - k + 1}} |N_H(S)| \leq (1 + \epsilon) \binom{n}{2(k - \ell) - 1} p.$$

Applying (11) we see that **qs** for every $b_1, b_2 \in B_i$,

$$Z_{b_1, b_2}^* \leq \left(1 + \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{k - \ell}{\ell}\right)^{2(k - \ell)} \binom{n}{2(k - \ell)} p^2. \quad (14)$$

Assume X_i is chosen so that (14) holds. Expose the random permutation σ_i of X_i . Let Z_{b_1, b_2} be the co-degree of b_1, b_2 in G_i , which is the number of blocks $X_{i,a}$ of X_i under σ_i such that $E_1 = X_{i,a} \cup X_{i,a+1} \cup Y_{i,b_1}, E_2 = X_{i,a} \cup X_{i,a+1} \cup Y_{i,b_2} \in \mathcal{E}$, and both edges E_1, E_2 are labeled by i . Then, recalling that an edge $E \in \mathcal{E}$ is labeled by i with probability $\frac{1}{f(E)} \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon)f_0}$, we get

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_{b_1, b_2}) \leq Z_{b_1, b_2}^* \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_X}{2k - 2\ell}} \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon)^2 f_0^2}.$$

Transposing one pair of elements of σ_i changes Z_{b_1, b_2} by at most 4. Using (11) again, we obtain that **qs** for every partition i and every pair $b_1, b_2 \in B_i$, the co-degree Z_{b_1, b_2} of b_1, b_2 in G_i satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{b_1, b_2} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{k - \ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k - 2\ell} \binom{n}{2k - 2\ell} p^2 \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_X}{2k - 2\ell}} \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon)^2 f_0^2} - n^{1/2} \log n \\ &\leq (1 + 5\epsilon)\nu_\ell p_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider $a_1, a_2 \in A_i$ and $X_{i,a_1}, X_{i,a_1+1}, X_{i,b_2}, X_{i,b_2+1}$ and expose a random set Y_i . Let Z_{a_1, a_2}^* be the number of subsets $S_1 \subset [n]$ of cardinality $|S_1| = 2\ell - k$ such that $S_1 \subset Y_i$ and both $S_1 \cup X_{i,a_1} \cup X_{i,a_1+1}$ and $S_1 \cup X_{i,a_2} \cup X_{i,a_2+1}$ form an edge in \mathcal{E} . By our assumption P_f ,

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_{a_1, a_2}^*) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \left(\frac{2\ell - k}{\ell}\right)^{2\ell - k} \binom{n}{2\ell - k} p^2.$$

Using assumption P_c we see that changing Y_i by one element changes Z_{a_1, a_2}^* by at most

$$\Delta_{a_1, a_2} = \max_{S \in \binom{[n]}{2(k - \ell) + 1}} |N_H(S)| \leq (1 + \epsilon) \binom{n}{2\ell - k - 1} p.$$

Applying (11) we see that **qs** for every $b_1, b_2 \in B_i$,

$$Z_{a_1, a_2}^* \leq \left(1 + \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{k - \ell}{\ell}\right)^{2k - 2\ell} \binom{n}{2k - 2\ell} p^2. \quad (15)$$

Assume Y_i is chosen so that (15) holds. Expose the random permutation τ_i of Y_i . Let Z_{a_1, a_2} be the co-degree of a_1, a_2 in G_i , which is the number of blocks $Y_{i,b}$ of Y_i under τ_i such that

$E_1 = X_{i,a_1} \cup X_{i,a_1+1} \cup Y_{i,b}$, $E_2 = X_{i,a_2} \cup X_{i,a_2+1} \cup Y_{i,b} \in \mathcal{E}$, and both edges E_1, E_2 are labeled by i . Then, recalling that an edge $E \in \mathcal{E}$ is labeled by i with probability $\frac{1}{f(E)} \leq \frac{1}{(1-\frac{3}{2}\epsilon)f_0}$, we get

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_{a_1,a_2}) \leq Z_{a_1,a_2}^* \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_Y}{2\ell-k}} \frac{1}{(1-\frac{3}{2}\epsilon)^2 f_0^2}.$$

Transposing one pair of elements of τ_i changes Z_{a_1,a_2} by at most 4. Using (11) again, we obtain that \mathbf{q}_s for every partition i and every pair $a_1, a_2 \in B_i$, the co-degree Z_{a_1,a_2} of a_1, a_2 in G_i satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{a_1,a_2} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{2\ell-k}{\ell}\right)^{2\ell-k} \binom{n}{2\ell-k} p^2 \frac{\nu_\ell}{\binom{N_Y}{2\ell-k}} \frac{1}{(1-\frac{3}{2}\epsilon)^2 f_0^2} - n^{1/2} \log n \\ &\leq (1+5\epsilon)\nu_\ell p_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now apply Lemma 6 below with $N = \nu_\ell, d = p_0, \theta = 5\epsilon$ to show that each G_i contains at least $(1-(5\epsilon)^{1/3})\nu_\ell p_0 \geq (1-2\epsilon^{1/3})m/rn$ edge disjoint perfect matchings. This will complete the proof of Theorem 3 for the case $\ell < k < 2\ell$.

Lemma 6 *Let G be a bipartite graph with vertex set $A \cup B$ where $|A| = |B| = N$. Suppose that the minimum degree in G is at least $(1-\theta)dN$ and the maximum co-degree of two vertices is at most $(1+\theta)d^2N$ for some small value $\theta \ll 1$. Suppose further that $\theta^{4/3}d^2N \gg 1$. Then G contains a collection of $(1-\theta^{1/3})dN$ edge disjoint perfect matchings.*

The assumption $\theta^{4/3}d^2N \gg 1$ in the above lemma is mostly for convenience and is implied in our circumstances by the assumption $\epsilon^5 \gg \log^3 n / (n^{1/2}p^2)$ of Theorem 3; it can be relaxed somewhat.

Proof Let $d_0 = (1-\theta)d$ and $d_1 = (1-\theta^{1/3})d$. Going back to (2) we see that we need to show that

$$m \geq (k-\ell)d_1N \tag{16}$$

for all $K \subseteq A, L \subseteq B, |K| = k, |L| = \ell, m = e(K, B \setminus L)$. Obviously we can assume $k > \ell$.

Now,

$$m \geq k(d_0N - \ell)$$

and so (16) is satisfied if

$$k(d_0N - \ell) \geq (k-\ell)d_1N$$

or

$$k(d_0 - d_1)N \geq (k - d_1N)\ell.$$

In particular, (16) holds if $\ell \leq (d_0 - d_1)N$. Furthermore, we also have

$$m \geq (N - \ell)(d_0N - (N - k)).$$

If $N - \ell \leq (d_0 - d_1)N$ then this implies that (16) holds.

So we assume from now on that

$$(d_0 - d_1)N < \min \{\ell, N - \ell\}. \quad (17)$$

We can further assume that $\ell \leq N/2$. For $\ell > N/2$ we can reverse the roles of A, B and show that $e(B \setminus L, A \setminus (A \setminus K)) \geq ((N - \ell) - (N - k))d_1N$, which is (16).

We now perform the usual double counting trick by estimating the number of paths of the form K, B, K in two ways. On one hand, each such path corresponds to a common neighbor of a pair of vertices $a_1, a_2 \in K$. Therefore, the quantity to be estimated is at most $\binom{k}{2}d_2^2N$, where $d_2 = (1 + \theta)^{1/2}d$. On the other hand, it is exactly

$$\sum_{b \in B} \binom{d(b, K)}{2} = \sum_{b \in B \setminus L} \binom{d(b, K)}{2} + \sum_{b \in L} \binom{d(b, K)}{2}$$

where $d(b, K)$ is the number of neighbors of b in K in the graph G . Since $\sum_{b \in B \setminus L} d(b, K) = m$, we can estimate the first summand as follows:

$$\sum_{b \in B \setminus L} \binom{d(b, K)}{2} \geq (N - \ell) \binom{\frac{m}{N - \ell}}{2} = \frac{m \left(\frac{m}{N - \ell} - 1 \right)}{2}.$$

As for the second summand, the number of edges between L and K can be estimated from below by $d_0Nk - m$, and therefore

$$\sum_{b \in L} \binom{d(b, K)}{2} \geq \ell \binom{\frac{d_0kN - m}{\ell}}{2} = \frac{d_0kN - m}{2} \left(\frac{d_0kN - m}{\ell} - 1 \right).$$

It follows that

$$m \left(\frac{m}{N - \ell} - 1 \right) + (d_0kN - m) \left(\frac{d_0kN - m}{\ell} - 1 \right) \leq k(k - 1)d_2^2N.$$

After performing straightforward arithmetic manipulations, we get to:

$$(m - d_0k(N - \ell))^2 \leq k(N - \ell)(k\ell d_2^2 - k\ell d_0^2 + d_0\ell).$$

Recalling the definitions of d_0 and d_2 , we see that

$$d_2^2 - d_0^2 = (1 + \theta - (1 - \theta)^2)d^2 = (3\theta + \theta^2)d^2.$$

Also, since $k \geq \ell$ and $\ell \geq (d_0 - d_1)N \geq \theta^{1/3}dN/2$ by (17), we see that $\theta dk \geq \theta^{4/3}d^2N/2 \gg 1$ by the lemma's assumption. Hence $d_0\ell \ll \theta d^2k\ell$. We thus arrive at the following inequality:

$$(m - d_0k(N - \ell))^2 \leq 4\theta d^2k^2\ell(N - \ell). \quad (18)$$

Since $\ell \leq N/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m &\geq (N - \ell)kd_0 \left(1 - \frac{2\ell^{1/2}\theta^{1/2}}{(1 - \theta)(N - \ell)^{1/2}}\right) \\ &\geq (N - \ell)kd_0 \left(1 - \frac{2\theta^{1/2}}{1 - \theta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies (16) if

$$\frac{d_1}{d} \leq \frac{(N - \ell)k}{(k - \ell)N} \left(1 - \frac{2\theta^{1/2}}{1 - \theta}\right) (1 - \theta).$$

Since $\frac{k(N - \ell)}{(k - \ell)N} \geq 1$, it is enough to verify that

$$\frac{d_1}{d} \leq (1 - \theta - 2\theta^{1/2}).$$

This is implied by

$$d_1 \leq d(1 - \theta^{1/3}).$$

Thus there will be $d(1 - \theta^{1/3})$ edge disjoint perfect matchings. \square

Case 2: $k = 2\ell$ (Theorem 4).

When $\ell = k/2$ we have $N_Y = 0$ and the argument above breaks down. We can however use our result from [5] to obtain something.

We will construct the Hamilton cycles via the following algorithm: We first chose f_0 such that

$$\frac{\log n}{\epsilon^2} \ll f_0 \ll \min \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2 np}{\log n}, \frac{\epsilon^3 np}{\log n} \right\}.$$

F_1 : Let

$$r = \frac{(2 - \epsilon) \binom{n}{k} f_0}{\nu_\ell^2}; \quad p_0 = \frac{p}{f_0}.$$

F_2 : Now choose r random partitions $\mathcal{P}_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, of $[n]$ into ν_ℓ sets of size ℓ .

F_3 : For each $E \in \mathcal{E}$ we let $f(E)$ denote the number of i such that \mathcal{P}_i contains a pair of parts X, Y such that $X \cup Y = E$. The random variable $f(E)$ is distributed as $Bin(r, \rho)$ where

$$\rho = \frac{\binom{\nu_\ell}{2}}{\binom{n}{k}}.$$

So, **qs** $(1 - \epsilon)f_0 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$. Choose one of these $f(E)$ instances at random and label the edge E with the chosen i .

F_4 : For each i let G_i be the graph obtained from $G_{\mathcal{P}_i}$ by including only edges with label i . We will show below in Lemma 7 that **qs** each G_i is $((1 - 2\epsilon)p_0, 2\epsilon p_0)$ -regular.

F_5 : We then apply Theorem 1 to show that **qs** each G_i contains at least $((1 - 2\epsilon)\frac{p_0}{2} - 8\epsilon p_0) \nu_\ell$ edge disjoint Hamilton cycles. Each such Hamilton cycle corresponds to a Hamilton cycle of type ℓ in H , and the so obtained Hamilton cycles in H are edge disjoint.

Thus H contains at least

$$r \left((1 - 2\epsilon)\frac{p_0}{2} - 8\epsilon p_0 \right) \nu_\ell \geq \frac{\binom{n}{k} p}{n_\ell} (1 - 20\epsilon)$$

edge disjoint type ℓ Hamilton cycles, proving Theorem 4.

Lemma 7 *Let G be a ν vertex, (α, ϵ) -regular graph. Suppose that G_0 is the random subgraph of G where each edge e of G is included independently with probability p_e , where $(1 - \epsilon)p^* \leq p_e \leq p^* = \Theta(1/\log^2 \nu)$. Suppose that*

$$\epsilon^2 \alpha \nu p^* \gg \log \nu \text{ and } \alpha \epsilon^3 \nu p^* \gg \log 1/\epsilon.$$

Then G_0 is $((1 - 2\epsilon)\alpha p^, 2\epsilon \alpha p^*)$ -regular, **qs**.*

Proof The degree of vertex v in G_0 dominates $\text{Bin}(\alpha \nu, (1 - \epsilon)p^*)$ and so Property Q_a holds from Chernoff bounds. Similarly the number of edges between two sets S, T dominates $\text{Bin}((\alpha - \epsilon)|S||T|, (1 - \epsilon)p^*)$ and is dominated by $\text{Bin}((\alpha - \epsilon)|S||T|, p^*)$ and Property Q_b also holds from Chernoff bounds. \square

Case 3: $k = \ell$ (Theorem 5).

Here the aim is to find many edge disjoint perfect matchings. We construct them via the following algorithm: We first choose f_0 such that (9) holds.

G_1 : Let

$$r = (1 - \epsilon) \binom{n}{k} \frac{f_0}{\nu_k^2}; \quad p_0 = \frac{p}{f_0}.$$

G_2 : Let $k_X = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ and $k_Y = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and

$$N_X = \frac{k_X}{k} n \text{ and } N_Y = \frac{k_Y}{k} n.$$

G_3 : Choose r random partitions $(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, r$, of $[n]$ into two sets of size N_X and N_Y respectively.

We use the notation

$$X_i = \{x_{i,1} < x_{i,2} < \dots < x_{i,N_X}\} \text{ and } Y_i = \{y_{i,1} < y_{i,2} < \dots < y_{i,N_Y}\}.$$

G_4 : For each i we let σ_i be a random permutation of X_i and let τ_i be a random permutation of Y_i . Form the partition $X_{i,a}$, $a = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_k$, of X_i into sets of size k_X and the partition $Y_{i,b}$, $b = 1, 2, \dots, \nu_k$, of Y_i into sets of size k_Y . Here $X_{i,a} = \{x_{i,\sigma_i((a-1)k_X+1)}, \dots, x_{i,\sigma_i(ak_X)}\}$ and $Y_{i,b} = \{y_{i,\tau_i((b-1)k_Y+1)}, \dots, y_{i,\tau_i(bk_Y)}\}$.

G_5 : Suppose now that for $E \in \mathcal{E}$ there are $f(E)$ instances i such that for some a, b and some partition S_1, S_2 of E we have $S_1 = X_{i,a}$ and $S_2 = Y_{i,b}$. We say that i includes E . Choose one of the $f(E)$ instances at random and label edge E with the chosen i .

Thus $f(E)$ is distributed as $Bin(r, \rho)$ where

$$\rho = \frac{\nu_k^2}{\binom{n}{k}}.$$

So, $(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon)f_0 \leq f(E) \leq f_0$ **qs**.

G_6 : Let G_i be the bipartite graph with vertex partition A_i and B_i comprising disjoint copies of $[\nu_k]$. For $a \in A_i$ and $b \in B_i$ we make (a, b) an edge of G_i if $E = X_{i,a} \cup Y_{i,b} \in \mathcal{E}$ and E is labelled with i . So, by construction, each $e \in E$ is associated with at most one G_i .

G_7 : We claim (see Lemmas 6 and 8) that **whp** each G_i will contain at least

$$n_0 = (1 - 2\epsilon^{1/3})\nu_k p_0$$

edge disjoint perfect matchings.

So H will contain at least rn_0 edge disjoint perfect matchings, completing the proof of Theorem 5.

Lemma 8 Whp, over our random choices of $X_i, Y_i, \sigma_i, \tau_i$, each G_i has minimum degree at least $(1 - 2\epsilon)\nu_k p_0$ and maximum co-degree at most $(1 + 5\epsilon)\nu_k p_0^2$.

Proof The arguments here are very similar to those in Lemma 5, so we will be rather brief. We fix i and focus on G_i . We first show that the minimum degree in G_i is large. For $a \in A_i$, denote by Z_a its degree in G_i . Then, using assumptions R_a and R_c and martingale-type arguments, we can show that

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_a) \geq (1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon) \left(\frac{k_Y}{k}\right)^{k_Y} \binom{n}{k_Y} p \frac{\nu_k}{\binom{N_Y}{k_Y}} \frac{1}{f_0}.$$

Using concentration results for permutation graphs again, we derive that **qs** for every partition i and every $a \in A_i$, the degree of a in G_i is at least

$$(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon) \left(\frac{k_Y}{k}\right)^{k_Y} \binom{n}{k_Y} p \frac{\nu_k}{\binom{N_Y}{k_Y}} \frac{1}{f_0} - n^{1/2} \log n \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)\nu_k p_0,$$

due to our assumption on ϵ .

Let now Z_b denote the degree of vertex $b \in B_i$ in G_i . We can argue similarly, while invoking assumptions R_b, R_d , to show that **qs** for every partition i and every $b \in B_i$,

$$Z_b \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)\nu_k p_0.$$

Finally, we treat the co-degrees of pairs of vertices in G_i . Let $b_1, b_2 \in B_i$. Let Z_{b_1, b_2} be their co-degree in G_i . Then using assumption R_e and martingale-type concentration arguments, we can prove that **qs** for every partition i and every pair of vertices $b_1, b_2 \in B_i$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{b_1, b_2} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{k_X}{k}\right)^{k_X} \binom{n}{k_X} p^2 \frac{\nu_k}{\binom{N_X}{k_X}} \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right)^2 f_0^2} - n^{1/2} \log n \\ &\leq (1 + 5\epsilon)\nu_k p_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $a_1, a_2 \in A_i$, let Z_{a_1, a_2} be their co-degree in G_i . Then using assumption R_f and martingale-type concentration arguments, we can prove that **qs** for every partition i and every pair of vertices $a_1, a_2 \in A_i$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{a_1, a_2} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right) \left(\frac{k_Y}{k}\right)^{k_Y} \binom{n}{k_Y} p^2 \frac{\nu_k}{\binom{N_Y}{k_Y}} \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{3}{2}\epsilon\right)^2 f_0^2} - n^{1/2} \log n \\ &\leq (1 + 5\epsilon)\nu_k p_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper we have derived sufficient conditions for packing almost edges of k -uniform random and pseudo-random hypergraphs into disjoint type ℓ Hamilton cycles. This appears to be a first result of this kind for the problem of packing Hamilton cycles in this setting. There is no reason to believe our assumptions on the edge probability $p(n)$ or the density of a pseudo-random hypergraph are tight, and it would be quite natural to try and extend them and to obtain tight(er) bounds.

Our results say nothing at all for the case $\ell < k/2$. It would be nice to extend our results to this, apparently harder, case.

In our paper we managed to circumvent the absence of results and techniques for the appearance of a Hamilton cycle of essentially any type in a random hypergraph $H(n, p, k)$ by going to much larger edge probabilities/densities than any plausible guess for the threshold for the appearance of a single Hamilton cycle. It would be very interesting to address specifically the question of the appearance of a Hamilton cycle in the random hypergraph and to derive better upper bounds on the corresponding threshold.

In the paper [6] we were able to show how to use the results of [5] in a game theoretic setting. More precisely, we showed how to play a Maker-Breaker type of game on the complete graph where Maker is able to construct an $(1/2 - \epsilon, \epsilon)$ -regular graph, $\epsilon = o(1)$. We could then use the results of [5] to show that Maker could construct approximately $n/4$ edge disjoint Hamilton cycles when alternately choosing edges against an adversary. The techniques of that paper can be extended to the hypergraph setting in a straightforward manner.

References

- [1] R. F. Bailey and B. Stevens, *Hamiltonian decompositions of complete k -uniform hypergraphs*, Discrete Mathematics, in press.
- [2] Zs. Baranyai, On the factorization of the complete uniform hypergraph, In: *Infinite and finite sets*, Vol. I, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai, Vol. 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975, 91–108.
- [3] B. Bollobás, **Random graphs**, 2nd ed., Vol. 73, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [4] F. R. K. Chung, R. L. Graham, and R. M. Wilson, *Quasi-random graphs*, Combinatorica 9 (1989), 345–362.
- [5] A.M. Frieze and M. Krivelevich, *On packing Hamilton cycles in ϵ -regular graphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory Ser. B 94 (2005) 159–172.
- [6] A.M. Frieze, M. Krivelevich, O. Pikhurko and T. Szabo, *The game of JumbleG*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing 14 (2005) 783–794.
- [7] A.M. Frieze and B. Pittel, Perfect matchings in random graphs with prescribed minimal degree, *Trends in Mathematics, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel* (2004) 95–132.
- [8] H. Han and M. Schacht, *Dirac-type results for loose Hamilton cycles in uniform hypergraphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory Ser. B 100 (2010), 332–346.
- [9] S. Janson, T. Luczak and A. Ruciński, **Random graphs**, Wiley, New York, 2000.
- [10] A. Johansson, J. Kahn and V. Vu, *Factors in random graphs*, Random Structures and Algorithms 33 (2008), 1–28.
- [11] P. Keevash, D. Kuhn, R. Mycroft and D. Osthus, *Loose Hamilton cycles in hypergraphs*, manuscript.
- [12] M. Krivelevich and B. Sudakov, Pseudo-random graphs, In: *More sets, graphs and numbers*, E. Gyori, G. O. H. Katona, L. Lovasz, Eds., Bolyai Soc. Math. Studies Vol. 15, 199–262.

- [13] D. Kühn, R. Mycroft and D. Osthus, *Hamilton ℓ -cycles in uniform hypergraphs*, manuscript.
- [14] C. McDiarmid, Concentration, in: *Probabilistic Methods for Algorithmic Discrete Mathematics*, Algorithms Combin., 16, Springer, Berlin, 1998, 195–248.
- [15] A. Thomason, Pseudorandom graphs. In: *Random graphs '85 (Poznań, 1985)*, North-Holland Math. Stud., 144, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, 307–331.